

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

WILLIAM J. GRADFORD,

Plaintiff,

v.

F. VELASCO and T. WEBSTER,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:22-cv-01493-JLT-HBK (PC)

ORDER STRIKING PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE

(Doc. No. 8)


On December 27, 2022, Plaintiff filed a "Clerk's Notice" with the Court. (Doc. No. 8). Plaintiff states he is providing notice that he filed applications to proceed *in forma pauperis*. (*Id.*). Plaintiff as a pro se litigant is advised that the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure dictate the appropriate type of pleadings, including how motions are to be filed with the court. Fed. R. Civ. P. 7(b). Notices addressed to the Clerk do not qualify as a motion or pleading and are otherwise not proper. To the extent Plaintiff requests confirmation that his applications to proceed *in forma pauperis* were received, the Court confirms receipt of the duplicate applications. (*See* Doc. Nos. 4, 7). The Court will rule on the pending applications in due course.

Because the Notice serves no purpose and is otherwise an improper filing, the Court will direct the Clerk of Court to strike it from the docket.

1 Accordingly, it is **ORDERED**:

2 The Clerk of Court shall strike Plaintiff's improperly filed "Clerk's Notice" (Doc. No. 8)  
3 from the docket.

4  
5 Dated: January 3, 2023

  
HELENA M. BARCH-KUCHTA  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE